ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: GOAL TRAJECTORIES

DURING INTERACTIVE KNOWLEDGE

GOAL REASONING

Benjamin Bengfort, Doctor of Philosophy, 2016

Dissertation directed by: Professor Don Perlis

Department of Computer Science

[insert abstract here, maximum 2 pages]

GOAL TRAJECTORIES DURING INTERACTIVE-KNOWLEDGE GOAL REASONING

by

Benjamin Bengfort

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2016

Advisory Committee: Professor Don Perlis, Chair/Advisor Dr. Michael Cox, Co-Advisor Professor James A. Reggia Professor Ben Shneiderman Dr. David Aha © Copyright by Benjamin Bengfort 2016

Preface

If needed.

Foreword

If needed.

Dedication

If needed.

Acknowledgments

[Insert acknowledgements hers]

Table of Contents

List of Figures					ii
Lis	st of .	Abbrevi	iations	vii	ii
1	Intr	oductio	n		1
	1.1	Food 7	Truck Case Narrative		1
		1.1.1	Narratives		1
			1.1.1.1 Scenario One: Confusion		1
			1.1.1.2 Scenario Two: Going to a Movie		2
		1.1.2	Case Representation		3
			1.1.2.1 Scenario One Representation		4
			1.1.2.2 Scenario Two Representation		4
		1.1.3	Defining Goal Trajectories		5
			1.1.3.1 Scenario One: Goal Trajectories		5
			1.1.3.2 Scenario Two: Goal Trajectories		5
2	Kno	wledge	Goals	,	7
	2.1		iew		7
	2.2		usions		7
3	Inte	ractive	Reasoning for Knowledge Goals	;	8
	3.1		iew	. ?	8
	3.2		usions		8
A	System Design and Implementation				9
В	3 Other Resources and Texts				0
Bibliography					1

List of Figures

List of Abbreviations

 $\begin{array}{cc} \alpha & & \text{alpha} \\ \beta & & \text{beta} \end{array}$

IREAP Institute for Research in Electronics and Applied Physics

NSA National Security Agency

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Food Truck Case Narrative

This document explores an interaction between a concierge in Washington, D.C. and a tourist who is looking for somewhere "interesting" to eat. The tourist does not know that gourmet food trucks are part of the D.C. restaurant scene and is surprised at the recommendation of eating at a street vendor. The purpose of this narrative is to explore potential cases in a case based reasoning system relating to the narrative, and whether or not theyre are any goal trajectories.

1.1.1 Narratives

Below are several narrative scenarios for the food truck recommendation incident.

1.1.1.1 Scenario One: Confusion

In this scenario, the tourist asks the concierge, I have about an hour before my show tonight, where is somewhere interesting I could eat that is quick and not too expensive? The concierge replies, It is such a nice summer evening, why not spend the hour relaxing in Pershing Park, off of Pennsylvania Ave, a few blocks away from the theater. There are a number of food trucks parked there where you can get an interesting meal to eat in the park.

The tourist, concerned, wrinkles his nose and replies, How safe is it to eat at a food truck? Will I get food poisoning? Ive heard those trucks arent very good.

The concierge understands immediately the confusion and answers, I think you may be thinking of the contract hot dog and snack vendors that are along the Mall. Actually in DC we have a gournet food truck scene, where specialists serve a wide variety of excellent food from their trucks. I think youll really enjoy the color and flavor of these more expensive establishments; theyre certainly a step up from eating fast food!

1.1.1.2 Scenario Two: Going to a Movie

This scenario starts with slightly different constraints, the tourist asks the concierge, Do you have any recommendations for something interesting to do and eat tonight?

The concierge, possibly as a result of his last interaction, suggests, There is a gourmet food truck scene here in D.C. - you can use an app to track and find where trucks are setting up and explore the City sampling the variety of cuisine!

The tourist only looks slightly interested, Ok, well I wouldnt mind checking that out if I happen to see one, but I dont know how special it would be. The concierge is undeterred, Well, I know that you enjoy movies; at the Angelika Popup near Eastern Market, which is an independent movie theater that serves booze, theyre playing Chef starring Dustin Hoffman and Jon Favreau. Chef is about a professional chef who finds purpose and family when he quits his job as executive chef and travels across the country in a food truck. That might be interesting to do, then go explore food trucks in the area.

The tourist, now interested, agrees and asks Great idea! How do I get to the Angelika? What are the showtimes for Chef?

1.1.2 Case Representation

The above narratives are rich in detail and interaction. The question becomes, how can we design a system that can reason about cases like these from previous cases in order to provide the rich interactivity that the concierge can. In this section, we will discuss the narratives in terms of their concept, task, and context. Outline any potential goal trajectories, and discuss the following questions:

When do we retrieve old cases and how? Does something new occur? How can we adapt previous cases? How do we store the case in the casebase?

Note that the goals of the tourist are expressed as natural language knowledge goals. Knowledge goals also determine the representation of the case and retrieval.

1.1.2.1 Scenario One Representation

In this scenario I was trying to add a lot of context to the knowledge goal representation such that the routine case Where should I eat tonight could be heavily parameterized by:

speed of food (only an hour available) expense (wants something not too expensive) interesting (unique to DC, not standard fare) The concierge then adds in extra context such as: proximity to the theater (increases available time) weather (if its nice, outdoor eating is preferable)

It was my hope that the context could largely determine the recommendation for Food Trucks, since food-truck specific cases might include details about weather, interestingness, and expense; and that other cases would be eliminated as good choices.

In the confusion resolution part of the narrative, I was hoping to use conceptdriven knowledge. E.g. is there an anomaly in the explanation that Gourmet Food Trucks will give you food poisoning? Yes, that is a different type of food truck that will give you food poisoning.

1.1.2.2 Scenario Two Representation

In this scenario, I was attempting to perform case adaptation at least to a certain extent. Here a list of previous cases for evening activities include dinner and a movie. However, because there was a recent successful resolution with Food Trucks - provide this as a starting place for recommendation. Then adapt the dinner

and a movie case from before with something specific to Food Trucks - e.g. a food truck movie!

1.1.3 Defining Goal Trajectories

In this section, I attempt to define the goals of the tourist throughout the course of the narrative in order to expose goal trajectories or changes. Ill attempt to show the goals as a timeline across the course of the narrative.

1.1.3.1 Scenario One: Goal Trajectories

This scenario has a starting goal and two subgoals. The concierge adds another goal.

Goal0 - locate a place to eat with parameters Goal0.1 - determine safety of food truck Goal0.2 - clarify what food trucks are Goal1 - explain the difference between DC food trucks and hot dog stands

The expressed goals of the tourist are all in the Goal tree, however the concierge identifies the confusion of the user and adds a goal to the tourists goal trajectory, namely the explanation goal of what a DC food truck is.

1.1.3.2 Scenario Two: Goal Trajectories

This scenario attempted to explicitly change the goal in the course of the conversation.

Goal0 - determine evening plans Goal0.1 - find something to do Goal0.2 - find

something to eat Goal1 - determine how to find food trucks Goal2 - determine how special food trucks are? Goal3 - learn about movie plans Goal3.1 - learn about theater Goal3.2 - learn about movie Goal3.2.1 - learn about actors Goal3.2.2 - learn about genre Goal4 - explain connection been movie and food activities Goal5 - clarify movie plans Goal5.1 - locate movie theater Goal5.2 - determine movie showtimes

In this scenario the tourist provides explicit goals, which are refinements of earlier goals. I was hoping to show the trajectory, Where do I eat? to What show-times are playing? though these could be seen as part of the larger goal What do I do tonight? Both the concierge and the tourists add goals through the interaction.

Chapter 2: Knowledge Goals

- 2.1 Overview
- 2.2 Conclusions

Chapter 3: Interactive Reasoning for Knowledge Goals

- 3.1 Overview
- 3.2 Conclusions

Appendix A: System Design and Implementation

Appendix B: Other Resources and Texts

Bibliography

- [1] Ashwin Ram. Knowledge goals: A theory of interestingness. In *Proceedings of the Twelvth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, pages 206–214. Citeseer, 1990.
- [2] Mohamed Yahya, Klaus Berberich, Shady Elbassuoni, Maya Ramanath, Volker Tresp, and Gerhard Weikum. Natural language questions for the web of data. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 379–390. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012.
- [3] Barbara J. Grosz, Luke Hunsberger, and Sarit Kraus. Planning and acting together. *AI magazine*, 20(4):23, 1999.
- [4] Ramon Lopez De Mantaras, David McSherry, Derek Bridge, David Leake, Barry Smyth, Susan Craw, Boi Faltings, Mary Lou Maher, Michael T. Cox, Kenneth Forbus, and others. Retrieval, reuse, revision and retention in case-based reasoning. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 20(03):215–240, 2005.
- [5] Hctor Muoz-Avila and Michael T. Cox. Case-based plan adaptation: An analysis and review. *Intelligent Systems, IEEE*, 23(4):75–81, 2008.
- [6] Kristen Hammond, Robin Burke, Charles Martin, and Steven Lytinen. FAQ Finder: a case-based approach to knowledge navigation. In *Artificial Intelligence for Applications*, 1995. Proceedings., 11th Conference on, pages 80–86. IEEE, 1995.
- [7] Conor Hayes, Pdraig Cunningham, and Barry Smyth. A case-based reasoning view of automated collaborative filtering. In *Case-Based Reasoning Research and Development*, pages 234–248. Springer, 2001.
- [8] Robin D. Burke, Kristian J. Hammond, Vladimir Kulyukin, Steven L. Lytinen, Noriko Tomuro, and Scott Schoenberg. Question answering from frequently asked question files: Experiences with the FAQ Finder system. *AI magazine*, 18(2):57, 1997.

- [9] Rosina O. Weber, Kevin D. Ashley, and Stefanie Brninghaus. Textual case-based reasoning. *Knowledge Engineering Review*, 20(3):255–260, 2005.
- [10] Robin Burke, Kristian Hammond, Vladimir Kulyukin, Steven Lytinen, Noriko Tomuro, and Scott Schoenberg. Natural language processing in the FAQ Finder system: Results and prospects. In Working Notes from AAAI Spring Symposium on NLP on the WWW, pages 17–26, 1997.
- [11] Ashwin Ram. A theory of questions and question asking. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 1(3-4):273–318, 1991.
- [12] Xiaobing Xue, Jiwoon Jeon, and W. Bruce Croft. Retrieval models for question and answer archives. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 475–482. ACM, 2008.
- [13] Jiwoon Jeon, W. Bruce Croft, and Joon Ho Lee. Finding similar questions in large question and answer archives. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*, pages 84–90. ACM, 2005.
- [14] Ashwin Ram and Lawrence Hunter. A Goal-Based Approach to Intelligent Information Retrieval. In *Machine Learning: Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference*, pages 265–269. Citeseer, 1991.
- [15] Lawrence Hunter. Knowledge acquisition planning for inference from large databases. In System Sciences, 1990., Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Hawaii International Conference on, volume 2, pages 35–44. IEEE, 1990.
- [16] E. A. Domeshek, R. C. Schank, A. Kass, and C. K. Riesbeck. Abby: Exploring an indexing vocabulary for social advice. *Inside case-based explanation*, pages 127–166, 1994.
- [17] Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. Semantic Parsing on Freebase from Question-Answer Pairs. In EMNLP, pages 1533–1544, 2013.
- [18] Zhicheng Zheng, Xiance Si, Fangtao Li, Edward Y. Chang, and Xiaoyan Zhu. Entity disambiguation with Freebase. In *Proceedings of the The 2012 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Joint Conferences on Web Intelligence and Intelligent Agent Technology-Volume 01*, pages 82–89. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [19] Kurt Bollacker, R. Cook, and P. Tufts. A platform for scalable, collaborative, structured information integration. In *Intl. Workshop on Information Integration on the Web (IIWeb07)*, 2007.

- [20] Kurt Bollacker, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 1247–1250. ACM, 2008.
- [21] Anette Frank, Hans-Ulrich Krieger, Feiyu Xu, Hans Uszkoreit, Berthold Crysmann, Brigitte Jrg, and Ulrich Schfer. Question answering from structured knowledge sources. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 5(1):20–48, 2007.
- [22] Lynette Hirschman and Robert Gaizauskas. Natural language question answering: the view from here. *Natural Language Engineering*, 7(04):275–300, 2001.
- [23] Aditya Kalyanpur, J. William Murdock, James Fan, and Christopher Welty. Leveraging community-built knowledge for type coercion in question answering. In *The Semantic WebISWC 2011*, pages 144–156. Springer, 2011.
- [24] Christina Unger, Lorenz Bhmann, Jens Lehmann, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Daniel Gerber, and Philipp Cimiano. Template-based question answering over RDF data. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 639–648. ACM, 2012.
- [25] Gregory D. Abowd, Anind K. Dey, Peter J. Brown, Nigel Davies, Mark Smith, and Pete Steggles. Towards a better understanding of context and context-awareness. In *Handheld and ubiquitous computing*, pages 304–307. Springer, 1999.
- [26] Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schtze. *Introduction to information retrieval*, volume 1. Cambridge university press Cambridge, 2008.
- [27] John Prager, Jennifer Chu-Carroll, Eric W. Brown, and Krzysztof Czuba. Question answering by predictive annotation. In *Advances in Open Domain Question Answering*, pages 307–347. Springer, 2006.
- [28] Jiwoon Jeon, W. Bruce Croft, and Joon Ho Lee. Finding semantically similar questions based on their answers. In *Proceedings of the 28th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 617–618. ACM, 2005.
- [29] Gang Wang, Konark Gill, Manish Mohanlal, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y. Zhao. Wisdom in the social crowd: an analysis of quora. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1341–1352. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2013.
- [30] Fabian M. Suchanek, Gjergji Kasneci, and Gerhard Weikum. Yago: a core of semantic knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 697–706. ACM, 2007.

- [31] Sren Auer, Christian Bizer, Georgi Kobilarov, Jens Lehmann, Richard Cyganiak, and Zachary Ives. *Dbpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data*. Springer, 2007.
- [32] Michael T. Cox and Chen Zhang. Mixed-initiative goal manipulation. AI Magazine, 28(2):62, 2007.
- [33] Padraig Cunningham. A taxonomy of similarity mechanisms for case-based reasoning. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 21(11):1532–1543, 2009.
- [34] Anthony Fader, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Oren Etzioni. Open Question Answering Over Curated and Extracted Knowledge Bases.
- [35] Anthony Fader, Luke S. Zettlemoyer, and Oren Etzioni. Paraphrase-Driven Learning for Open Question Answering. In ACL (1), pages 1608–1618, 2013.
- [36] Tom Kwiatkowski, Eunsol Choi, Yoav Artzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Scaling semantic parsers with on-the-fly ontology matching. 2013.
- [37] Hctor Muoz-Avila, David W Aha, Dana S Nau, Rosina Weber, Len Breslow, and Fusun Yaman. SiN: Integrating case-based reasoning with task decomposition. Technical report, DTIC Document, 2001.
- [38] David McSherry. Explanation in recommender systems. Artificial Intelligence Review, 24(2):179–197, 2005.
- [39] Qingqing Cai and Alexander Yates. Large-scale Semantic Parsing via Schema Matching and Lexicon Extension. In ACL (1), pages 423–433. Citeseer, 2013.
- [40] Qingqing Cai and Alexander Yates. Semantic parsing freebase: Towards opendomain semantic parsing. *Atlanta*, *Georgia*, *USA*, 30(328):92, 2013.
- [41] Percy Liang. Lambda dependency-based compositional semantics. arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.4408, 2013.
- [42] Steven Bird. NLTK: the natural language toolkit. In *Proceedings of the COL-ING/ACL on Interactive presentation sessions*, pages 69–72. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2006.
- [43] Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. Natural language processing with Python. "O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2009.
- [44] David McSherry. Conversational CBR in multi-agent recommendation. In IJCAI-05 Workshop on Multi-Agent Information Retrieval and Recommender Systems, pages 33–40. Citeseer, 2005.
- [45] James F. Allen and Choh Man Teng. Becoming different: A languagedriven formalism for commonsense knowledge. In 11th International Symposium on Logical Formalizations of Commonsense Reasoning, 2013.

- [46] David W. Aha, David McSherry, and Qiang Yang. Advances in conversational case-based reasoning. *The knowledge engineering review*, 20(03):247–254, 2005.
- [47] Mingyang Gu and Agnar Aamodt. A knowledge-intensive method for conversational CBR. In *Case-Based Reasoning Research and Development*, pages 296–311. Springer, 2005.
- [48] Wendy Lehnert. Human and Computational Question Answering. *Cognitive Science*, 1(1):47–73, 1977.
- [49] Janet Kolodner. Case-based reasoning. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
- [50] Michael T Cox and Manuela M Veloso. Goal transformations in continuous planning. In *Proceedings of the 1998 AAAI fall symposium on distributed continual planning*, pages 23–30, 1998.
- [51] Stacy Lovell Pfautz, Gabriel Ganberg, Adam Fouse, and Nathan Schurr. A General Context-Aware Framework for Improved Human-System Interactions. *AI Magazine*, 36(2), 2015.